REMARKS

The Examiner is thanked for withdrawing the finality of the previous Office Action and entering the submission of October 2, 2008.

The correct serial number for the Spiegel reference on the Information Disclosure Statement is 2002-0003312 as shown on the International Search Report of November 14, 2004 which has been considered.

The Examiner objected to the drawings as not illustrating the "at least one feeding collector has a square or rectangular section" as recited in claim 5. This objection has been rendered moot by the cancellation of claim 5.

In paragraph 6 of the Office Action, claims 11, 13 and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C.§112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. Claim 11 has been canceled and thus this ground of rejection has been rendered moot.

Claims 1, 3-7, 9-11, 13, 14, 17 and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. \$112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter that the applicant regards as the invention.

Reconsideration is requested in view of this Amendment.

Claim 1 was noted as not having an antecedent basis for the terms "said assembly and blockage". By this amendment, the term "said" has been deleted and the "second tightener" has been inserted.

Claim 9 was objected to with regard to the expression "and opening and water circulation on said second ends". In response, this expression has been deleted.

Claim 10 was objected to on the basis that it was

uncertain what "distribution components" were being referenced. In response, claim 10 has been amended to delete the reference to the "distribution components".

Claim 13 was objected to on the basis that there was an insufficient basis for the limitation "the connection between the nozzle-holder ramps and vaporization nozzles". In response, this limitation has been canceled.

Claim 14 was objected to with regard to the lack of an antecedent basis for the expression "the expected operating pressures". In response, the term "the" has been canceled from this expression.

Claim 17 was objected to with regard to expression "wherein said U-shaped blocking element, fixed at base inside an indentation of a hexagonal head second tighteners", "and comprises elements" and " said two ends" in line 8. In response, claim 17 has been amended to insert "a" before the word --base--. In this regard, there is no requirement in the Rules that patent claims be grammatically correct as the definiteness standard requires that patent claims be a single "sentence" and have a certain amount of redundancy the necessity of the recitation of antecedent basis for each term. The expression "comprises curved elements" has been revised to recite "includes curved elements" for clarity. The expression Said two ends" has been rewritten as "two free ends".

Claim 18 was rejected as including an additional element which was deemed to be improper in that claim I recited "consisting of " the recited components. The term "shaped blocking element" is a generic term that appears in claim I and the recited elements in claim 18 point out a preferred "shaped blocking element". For this reason, a new element has not been introduced into claim 18.

Each claim has been carefully reviewed and it is believed that this Amendment removes all bases for the rejection under 35 U.S.C.§112, second paragraph.

In paragraph 9 of the Office Action, claims 1,3,4,5,6,7,9 and 10 were rejected as being unpatentable over Weeth in view of Siegler.

Reconsideration is requested.

The Weeth patent was applied as disclosing a water vaporization distribution plant consisting of a feeding collector; nozzle holder ramps; a series of vaporization nozzles; first tighteners; second tighteners an a shape blocking element. There is no mention in Weeth of water vaporization as the Weeth device is designed for "sprinkling water" on crops and not with the conversion of liquid water to water vapor. The Examiner has characterized the series of vaporization nozzles 30" in the Weeth patent. However, Weeth does not use the term vaporization nozzle and instead uses the term "sprinkling means 30" which does not even remotely suggest a vaporization nozzle, which is recited in all of the claims of the present application. Since Weeth is concerned with outdoor agricultural irrigation, where liquid water is applied to crops, there is no reason why one skilled in the art would consider the liquid irrigation system of Weeth in making a water vaporization system, as claimed, which requires a vaporization nozzle.

The Siegler patent is concerned with a sprinkler hose having a self winding capability. The use of a rectangular hose in such a self winding apparatus has no relevance to the applicants' claimed vaporization apparatus which has rectangular or square nozzle-holder ramps (15). The rectangular sections of the Siegler hose are not attached to any type of a nozzle and the connections that are made to the rectangular hose are at the ends where round threaded connectors are used. There is no reason to combine Weeth and Siegler except the applicant' specification as these references are concerned with mutually exclusive apparatuses that operate differently. For these reasons, it is requested that this ground of rejection be withdrawn.

New claim 19 is a combination of claims 1, 10 and 13. Since no prior art was applied against claim 13, it is requested that new claim 19 be favorably considered. Claim 20 is dependent on new claim 19 and it is based claim 14 which not rejected over the prior art. Claims 21-22 are based on claims 17 and 18, respectively, and are depended on new claim 19. Claims 17 and 18 were not rejected over the prior art and favorable consideration is requested. New claim 23 is a combination of claims 1 and 17 and claims 24-27 are based on claims 10, 13, 14 and 18. As noted above, claim 17 was not rejected over the prior art and favorable consideration of new claims 23-27 is requested.

An early and favorable action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

James V. Costigan Registration No.: 25, 669

MAILING ADDRESS

Hedman & Costigan, P.C. 1185 Avenue of the Americas New York, NY 10036 (212) 302-8989